2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
South Carolina

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season "leaf on" imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in South Carolina. In other words, "How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?" Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, **SC**, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery "late". Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 17 Feb 06. Out of the responses received, in South Carolina, 1453 of a possible 2185 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .665, for a rating of 66.5%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of "Satisfied" nudging towards a rating of "Neither Satisfied or Unsatisfied". The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is a good deal of room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around clouds, color quality, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q1, "Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?" Statistically, the highest scoring questions were Q4 and Q6, "Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?" and "Is the imagery useful for measurement services?" respectively.

Q1		*Q2*		*Q3*		*Q4*		*Q5*	
Mean	2.666666667	Mean	2.974358974	Mean	4.052631579	Mean	4.052631579	Mean	3.838709677
Standard Error	0.177451342	Standard Error	0.189063961	Standard Error	0.209813873	Standard Error	0.192118416	Standard Error	0.20265323
Median	2	Median	3	Median	4.5	Median	4	Median	4
Mode	2	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.108183277	Standard Deviation	1.18070406	Standard Deviation	1.293379575	Standard Deviation	1.184297452	Standard Deviation	1.128325432
Sample Variance	1.228070175	Sample Variance	1.394062078	Sample Variance	1.672830725	Sample Variance	1.402560455	Sample Variance	1.27311828
Kurtosis	0.062879206	Kurtosis	-1.08765651	Kurtosis	1.103586097	Kurtosis	1.752021961	Kurtosis	2.189096757
Skewness	0.715630897	Skewness	-0.049282381	Skewness	-1.447498916	Skewness	-1.549176345	Skewness	-1.59717385
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	104	Sum	116	Sum	154	Sum	154	Sum	119
Count	39	Count	39	Count	38	Count	38	Count	31

Q6		*Q7*		*Q8*		*Q9_x2*		*Q10_X2*	
Mean	3.918918919	Mean	3.703703704	Mean	3.90625	Mean	5.58974359	Mean	5.58974359
Standard Error	0.210027806	Standard Error	0.205444517	Standard Error	0.170148032	Standard Error	0.416783436	Standard Error	0.375925217
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	6	Median	6
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	6	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.277549268	Standard Deviation	1.067521025	Standard Deviation	0.962502618	Standard Deviation	2.602811726	Standard Deviation	2.347652228
Sample Variance	1.632132132	Sample Variance	1.13960114	Sample Variance	0.92641129	Sample Variance	6.77462888	Sample Variance	5.511470985
Kurtosis	0.221424484	Kurtosis	1.49903325	Kurtosis	1.346362348	Kurtosis	-1.025176778	Kurtosis	-0.705778928
Skewness	-1.108172145	Skewness	-1.193700142	Skewness	-0.960725451	Skewness	0.024441187	Skewness	0.421165348
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	145	Sum	100	Sum	125	Sum	218	Sum	218
Count	37	Count	27	Count	32	Count	39	Count	39

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results